

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action of October 30, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-4, 6-11, 13-20 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Lowell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,687).

Claim 10 was objected to for containing minor informalities.

The Present Application

The present application is directed to an emergency response system for summoning and routing potential emergency responders to the location of a victim. The system comprises a central station configured to receive and store information and locations of emergencies. The central station is also configured to transmit a trigger signal to a selected remote emergency response device to start a broadcast to attract as many potential emergency responders as possible to the victim. The emergency response device also provides routing information to the victim for the emergency responders through the use of a navigation unit in the emergency response device.

The present application further relates to an emergency response device and a method for summoning an emergency responder and for routing the emergency responder to the victim.

The above description of the present application is presented to the Examiner as background information to assist the Examiner in understanding the application. The above description is not used to limit the claims in any way.

The Reference of Record

Lowell et al. discloses an emergency response system for detecting, locating, and responding to a predetermined medical emergency that can be treated with portable medical equipment. A processor activates a personal alarm at the location of the person suffering the emergency which indicates the emergency and the

victim's location to those in the victim's immediate area. The processor also transmits an alarm signal to an alarm indicator on the portable medical equipment to alert an emergency response person that a victim is in immediate need of such equipment. The processor also transmits or causes transmission of an alarm signal to a remote emergency response center which receives the alarm and dispatches an emergency response person or emergency response team to the victim.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 has been amended to correct the minor informality noted by the Examiner.

The Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the Reference of Record

Claims 2-4, 6-11, 13-20 are not anticipated by Lowell et al. **Claim 2** has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of independent **claim 1** which, in turn, has been cancelled.

More specifically, regarding **claim 2**, Lowell et al. does not disclose a detection means arranged to activate the navigation means upon detection of an interaction with the emergency response device. The Office Action refers Applicant to Figure 1 and Col. 7 lines 32-64 which discloses an emergency response system for detecting, locating, and responding to a medical emergency that can be treated with portable medical equipment. More specifically, Lowell et al. discloses a guidance unit as part of the AED machine that receives alarm signals from a locator broadcast initiator or the location processor unit that contain information about a victim's location. Additionally, Lowell et al. discloses the alarm signals being loaded into the guidance unit when they are received to enable the guidance unit to use GPS and immediately guide the emergency response person to the victim when the emergency response person arrives. Communicating with an external positions system requires considerable power consumption and reduces the life of the remote emergency response device. It is respectfully submitted that Lowell et al. does not disclose navigation means that are activated only upon detection of interaction with the emergency response device. Lowell also does not disclose anything for example to reduce the power consumption by the emergency response device.

Accordingly it is submitted that **claim 2** and **claims 3 and 14-17** which depend therefrom distinguish patentably from the references of record.

As per **claim 4** and dependent claims **6-10 and 18-20**, Lowell et al, does not disclose or suggest an emergency response device comprising a detector configured to activate the navigation unit upon detection of an interaction between the emergency responder and the emergency response device.

Claim 4 further calls for the navigation unit to be in the emergency response device, such as an AED, (claim 10), rather than in a remote location. This eliminates the need for interaction with a costly central dispatcher.

As per **claim 18**, Lowell does not suggest that a navigation unit on board an AED store a floor plan of at least a portion of the building in which it is located.

Accordingly it is submitted that **claims 4** and dependent claims **6-10, and 18-20** distinguish patentably from the references of record.

As per **claim 11** and dependent **claim 13**, Lowell et al. does not disclose or fairly suggest a method for summoning an emergency responder and for routing said responder to a victim comprising the step of activating the navigation means upon detection of an interaction between the emergency responder and the emergency response device. Accordingly it is submitted that **claim 11 and 13** distinguish patentably over the references.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that all claims are not anticipated by and distinguish patentably over the references of record. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.
Registration No. 28,383

Robert M. Sieg
Registration No. 34,446

FAY SHARPE LLP
The Halle Building, 5th Floor
1228 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115-1843
Telephone: (216) 363-9000 (main)
Telephone: (216) 363-9122 (direct)
Facsimile: (216) 363-9001
E-Mail: tkocovsky@faysharpe.com

Direct All Correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Reg. No. 51,742
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(440) 483-3455 (tel)
(440) 483-2452 (fax)